

Issue Category A - Preservation of the Quality of Life and Character of Neighborhoods

1. Issues Identified

- a. Preserving neighborhoods while providing housing for students. (6/14/07)
- b. Neighborhoods are losing their identity as older buildings are being demolished and being replaced by housing that is not considered traditional for the neighborhood. (6/14/07)
- c. Established neighborhoods wanting to remain owner-occupied and regain owner-occupation of residential properties. (6/14/07)
- d. Neighborhoods are suffering degradation when large numbers of students move into their neighborhoods. (6/14/07)
- e. Neighborhood representatives believe that neighborhoods are being required to sacrifice their desired lifestyle to "solve" the housing shortage at the U of A. (6/14/07)
- f. When students live in a guesthouse on a property or in smaller numbers in a single-family residence, problems with assimilation usually don't occur. Conversely, when high concentrations of students live together in unsupervised situations, that assimilation is more difficult. (6/14/07)
- g. The current land use code does not work. We need to take a departure from it that would take a neighborhood taking a risk on trying something else out. (6/14/07)

2. Questions Posed

- a. Are we too focused on UA affiliated residents? What about those that aren't students or staff at the U of A and just want to live in the area because it is lively and interesting? (Group C 7/21/07)
- b. Is student housing a problem/issue for the entire proposed overlay area? (Group C 7/21/07)
- c. Is the Jefferson Park plan something that could be applied/replicable? (Group C 7/21/07)
- d. How can we protect single family homes from being converted into rental units?
- e. Can you delete portions within an historic district so that portion is no longer historic? Does historic truly preserve the neighborhood? No requirement that rental properties in federal historic district maintain the property?
- f. How do we protect neighborhoods without adding regulations that harm good development?
- g. Are there neutral issues that can be applied to the preservation zone area rather than City-wide?
- h. The NPZ seems to offer incentives to builders/developers. Can the NPZ offer incentives to neighborhoods?

3. Suggestions:

- a. *Create a process for neighborhoods and developers to work together to preserve, construct and rehabilitate. (DHSW)**
- b. *The issue should be how to stabilize rather than "preserve". (Group C 6/28/07)*
- c. *Neighbors defining what they want in their neighborhoods including those neighborhoods that are do not have historic designation. " (Group C 6/28/07)**
- d. *New development should look like the rest of the neighborhood. (Group C 7/21/07)**
- e. *Have an expert analyze the neighborhoods and create a housing plan based on:*
 - i. *Need for housing (affordable, owner-occupied, renter units, etc.)*
 - ii. *Proactively decide what is appropriate for the neighborhood instead of letting the market decide*
- f. *Restore balance in the ratio of owner occupied properties versus rentals (NR)*
- g. *Identify key areas essential for preservation (see definition of what preservation bulleted below) (DHSW)**
 - i. *Historic Preservation (Local and Federal) (Group C 6/28)*
 - ii. *Ensuring compatibility, scale, mass, architectural styles (Group C 6/28)*

- iii. *Stability for the neighborhoods - balance between owner occupied and renter occupied--infill matches what exists in the neighborhood. (Group C 6/28)*
- iv. *Stability for developers (Group C 6/28)*
 - *Stabilize process so developers can build what they plan*
 - *Prevent "bad" developers from building as fast as possible with no consideration for the neighborhood.*
- h. *Maintain status of historic neighborhoods (Group C 6/28)**
 - i. *Current federal designation*
 - ii. *Create preservation laws for those neighborhoods that are not historic*
 - iii. *Keep the scale, architectural compatibility and character of the neighborhoods.*
- i. *Character includes: (DHSW)**
 - i. *Appearance of a single-family residential neighborhood (DHSW)*
 - ii. *Residential (DHSW)*
 - iii. *Appropriate off-street parking (DHSW)*
 - *R-1 regulations extended to R-2.*
 - *No double stacking*
 - iv. *Adequate garbage and recycle facilities (DHSW)*
 - v. *Homes with similar scale, height and open space (DHSW)*
 - *Height - no higher than 15' with neighbor privacy considerations (NR)*
 - *Lot coverage - 40% lot coverage (footprint of house without porches, driveways or parking) (NR)*
 - *Landscaping - 10 wide landscaping front and back of properties with more than 4 parking spaces at front. (NR)*
 - *Floor Area Ratio (FAR) - as applied to commercial starting at .30 FAR...3000 sq. ft house on 10,000 sq. foot lot not including the vehicle use area. (NR We need a residential Floor Area Ratio (Group C 7/21/07)*
 - *Setbacks - Increase to 10 feet or 3/4 the height of the building, whichever is greater. (NR)*
 - *Lot splits - not allowed (NR)*
- j. *Preserve neighborhoods with at least 50% owner occupancy, homes, churches and businesses over 50 years old, mature trees and other landscaping. (FA)**
- k. *Restrict multi-story to downtown and on arterials on property other than R-1 and R-2 (FA)**
- l. *Limit redevelopment of vacant lots to external lots (FA)*
- m. *Limit businesses to groceries, restaurants, cafes and prohibit bars and liquor stores (FA)*
- n. *Preserve elements of the streetscape. Buildings facing the street should be compatible in setback height and architectural style to surrounding historic homes (FA)**
- o. *Second story should be designed so that windows and balconies do not overlook neighbor's yards. (FA)**
- p. *Setbacks from the side and rear lot lines should be increased and based on numbers of stories as well as well as building height (FA)*
- q. *Front porches should not be enclosed (FA)**
- r. *Window and door openings visible from the street should not be filled in; replacements should be similar in style (FA)**
- s. *Additions only at rear of the building and compatible in style (roof line, size shape, placement and exterior materials (FA) --greater flexibility if not visible from street**
- t. *Where there is a two story, windows and balconies should not look into neighbor's yards (FA)**
- u. *Setbacks for two story should be increased based on number stories and building height (FA)**

- v. *Privacy mitigation should include setbacks, landscape buffers, sound walls (FA)**
- w. *Good infill can revitalize a neighborhood; bad infill contributes to its decline. Teardowns, rehabilitations of rundown properties and development on vacant lots can improve the entire areas appearance, economic value and safety, if done well (RB)**
- x. *Creating "neighborhood villages" for the university area neighborhoods which would provide work, education, leisure activities and offices, commercial and retail within easy walking, bicycling or mass transit to rental residences and owner occupied residents in the neighborhood. (DHSW)*
- y. *Historical occupancy in a neighborhood should be considered along with the historic structures (6/28/07)*
- z. *Only allow infill that is compatible with the neighborhood (Group A 7/21/07)**
- aa. *Use a Neighborhood Review Committee and/or a Design Review Board for development projects. (Group C 7/21/07)*
- bb. *Placing X number of bedrooms over X years in ways that preserve the character of the neighborhoods while allowing profitable development. (Group C 7/21/07)*
- cc. *To keep a neighborhood's historic status they must be 50% owner-occupied. Keep current or eligible historic neighborhoods at that status. (Group C - 7/28/07)*
- dd. *Use another word like "conservation" rather than "preservation". (Group C - 7/28/07)*

Incentives - Suggestions

- ee. *Members of the committee feel that incentives should be provided to builders to develop properties using "Smart" and "Green" Building principles. (6/14/07) Provide green building credits (Group A 7/28/07)**
- ff. *Trades off for intensifying land use might include:*
 - i. *Affordable housing, multi-use development attracting businesses, LEED building, environmentally desirable characteristics, pocket parks, meeting facilities, buffering beyond code, sidewalks beyond the property line. (RB)**
- gg. *Incentives should be contractually tied to continuing performance with a way to be legally and practically revoke the incentive for lack of performance. They should not take the form of tax give-aways. (FA/RB)* Possible incentives might include:*
 - i. *Streamline COT approval process*
 - ii. *Encouragement of innovative approaches*
 - iii. *Reduced impact fees*
 - iv. *Increased density --greater lot coverage and reduced setbacks*
 - v. *Reduced on-site parking requirements*
- hh. *. There should be incentives on both sides (neighborhoods and developers) (7/28/07)**
- ii. *Stone as incentive area (Group A - 7/21/07)*

4. Potential Areas of Agreement Related to this Issue Category

- 1. *It is important to preserve single family uses/historic areas*
- 2. *We need a Floor Area Ratio (FAR)*
- 3. *Maintain status of historic neighborhoods:*
 - a. *Current federal designation*
 - b. *Preservation laws for those neighborhoods that are not historic*
 - c. *Keep the scale, architectural compatibility/character of the neighborhoods.*

Issue Category B - Housing for Faculty and Staff

1. Issues Identified

- a. Staff and faculty wanting to live near the U of A (6/14/07)
- b. Neighborhoods in the U of A environs tend to be unstable environments and staff and faculty want to live in areas that are predictable and stable. (6/14/07)
- c. Staff and faculty at the U of A want to live in traditional neighborhoods in single-family detached homes. (6/14/07)
- d. We need to recognize that housing is an industry and there is economic value in providing and owning housing. (6/14/07)

2. Questions Posed

- a. Can surrounding R1 and R@ be used for faculty/staff?

3. Suggestions:

- a. *Rehabilitate existing housing stock in neighborhoods when feasible. (DHSW)*
- b. *The city and the university should redouble their efforts to revitalize neighborhoods around the university and promote staff living in the surrounding neighborhood (NR)*
- c. *Encourage the University of Arizona to offer employee assisted housing within the 2 mile area in the Pilot Overlay (RB)*

4. Potential Areas of Agreement Related to this Issue Category

- 1.

Issue Category C - How and Where to House Students

1. Issues Identified

- a. Concerns relating to the location of student housing considering economically feasible densities
- b. What expectations a resident of the neighborhoods in the U of A environs should have in terms of students living in the neighborhood. (6/14/07)
- c. Neighborhoods are harmed when student-housing units are introduced into established neighborhoods. (6/14/07)
- d. Student housing supervision (6/14/07)
- e. The state cannot mandate that the U of A provide housing for students. (6/14/07)
- f. Regardless of where and under what circumstances the students live, housing for 28,000 students needs to be provided. (6/14/07)
- g. Members of the committee felt that limiting the locations of student housing units would force those uses to move to the edge of the City and therefore just relocate the problem. (6/14/07)
- h. A ghetto of mini-dorms is being created in certain areas of the City and as a result a withdrawal of services is occurring in these areas. Too much student housing together may produce a student ghetto (6/14/07)
- i. We need to recognize that housing is an industry and there is economic value in providing and owning housing. (6/14/07)
- j. Lack of supervised student, coupled with increasing congestion and parking shortages will strain surrounding neighborhoods. (6/14/07)
- k. While there is room for the University to expand upward, lack of sufficient supervised student housing, coupled with congested roads and a shortage of parking will place a great strain on the community (NR)

2. Questions Posed

- a. How can the proximity needs of students be met with less impact on the established neighborhoods?
- b. Is there a cap for the number of students?
- c. Where has student housing/housing planning worked in other communities?

3. Suggestions

- a. *The core issue is "where should the students live?" (Group B 7/28/07)**
- b. *There are student housing developments in the Starr Pass area that have shuttle services to the U of A and when the Christopher City development was still in existence, students lived north of the University with little or no affect on other City residents. (6/14/07)*
- c. *There are appropriate locations for student housing in high-rise, high-density structures along major transportation corridors. (5/14/07)**
- d. *Tech Park may be potential area for student housing (Group B 6/28/07)**
- e. *Take advantage of existing pedestrian paths near campus (under Speedway) (DSHW)**
- f. *Plan for more intense, higher density areas along major corridors --streetcar, Cat Tran routes, bicycle paths and major streets and routes. (DHSW)**
- g. *Provide supervised housing for all undergraduate. (NR)*
- h. *University should consider the Tech Park near Rita Ranch as a satellite campus with opportunity for abundant student housing. (NR)**
- i. *Build high density, supervised student housing: (RB)**
 - i. *Along streetcar, major arterials with buffers to protect the inner residential areas and to preserve any historic structures which may be located along these routes.*
 - ii. *Re-zoning industrial sites for this purpose*
- j. *Private/public agreements to rehab existing apartment complexes off campus for supervised student housing.*
- k. *4th and 6th area north of Toole might be considered - not near neighborhoods, good services, etc. (Group B 7/28/07)*
- l. *Look at industrial areas close to UA. Rezone for residential student uses (Group B 7/28/07)**

4. Potential Areas of Agreement Related to this Issue Category

- a. *You cannot house all students needing housing in residential neighborhoods*
- b. *It is better to house students in multiple unit (mini-dorms) dwellings when they are located along transportation corridors rather than in neighborhoods. (6/14/07)*
- c. *Not all student housing must be in the pilot overlay area. (6/14/07)*
- d. *6-8 students per property is not an efficient way to address housing for a large unhoused student population (Group B-6/28/07)*
- e. *The University will continue to expand and student enrollment will increase. (NR)*

Issue Category D - Nuisance/Student Behavior Issues

1. Issues Identified

- a. Quality of life issues related to bad behavior of students, on-street parking, parking in the front yards of properties, interference with trash collection and mail delivery were mentioned. High number of rentals can cause high stress neighborhoods with excessive traffic, disregard for speed, lack of weed control, vandalism, destructive behavior (6/14/07)
- b. Nuisance issues versus zoning issues. (6/14/07)

- c. A question was raised about imposing stricter penalties for "red tagging" (6/14/07)
- d. A committee member stated concern that students were being generalized as "bad" elements, undesirables and as criminals. (6/14/07)
- e. A ghetto of mini-dorms is being created in certain areas of the City and as a result a withdrawal of services is occurring in these areas. (6/14/07)
- f. When high concentrations of students live together in unsupervised situations, assimilation into an neighborhood is difficult (6/14/07)

2. *Suggestions*

- a. *There are student housing developments in the Starr Pass area that have shuttle services to the U of A and when the Christopher City development was still in existence, students lived north of the University with little or no affect on other City residents. (6/14/07)*
- b. *Provide supervised housing for all undergraduate. (NR)*
- c. *University should consider the Tech Park near Rita Ranch as a satellite campus with opportunity for abundant student housing. (NR)**
- d. *Working with the University to find better solutions for providing adequate student housing and improving student/neighborhood interactions. (RB)*
- e. *Investigate what other communities are doing to address these same problems (Ohio State). (RB)*
- f. *The U of A should buy existing apartment buildings/complexes and use them as student housing and provide supervision (6/14/07)*
- g. *Harsher rules for students that create disturbances (Group B - 7/21/07)*

3. *Potential Areas of Agreement Related to this Issue Category*

- a. *Undergraduates should reside in supervised housing situations although this cannot be mandated.*

Issue Category E - Overlay As a Concept

1. **Issues Identified**

- a. When residents add on to or expand their homes, guidelines in that particular overlay area may have far reaching affects that are not anticipated. (6/14/07)
- b. Concern was mentioned regarding older homes located on the edges of neighborhoods that are zoned R-2 or R-3 that are being demolished and then redeveloped with higher density residential uses. Infill development is not intended to increase densities everywhere in the City. (6/14/07)
- c. The committee discussed reducing the size of the pilot area to only those neighborhoods immediately adjacent to the University; however, other neighborhood representatives felt that the affects of actions taken in the U of A environs would reach their neighborhoods also. (6/14/07)

2. **Questions Posed**

- a. Should there be a definition of "family" for the pilot overlay and the NPZ?
- b. Are minidorms the issue that is really "driving" this? Is solving the minidorm issue all that needs to be done to reduce the problem?
- c. What is appropriate for development in the U of A area in light of the nees of the entire area - NPZ, pilot area?
- d. Which of the overlay options presented has the most "teeth" and has the ability to be enforced?
- e. Will the regulations apply to the entire overlay or just in the pilot area?
- f. Will the pilot overlay area and NPZ be enforced and is there a budget and staffing for enforcement of the overlay regulations?
- g. The LUC is already difficult to deal with - do we need more regulations?

- h. What is good for the whole community - not just for those areas in the overlay?
- i. Are their neutral issues that can be applied to the preservation zone area rather than City-wide?
- j. Is there a time limit on applying the regulations for the pilot area?
- k. Where should the density go? (Group C - 7/21/07)

3. Suggestions:

- a. *The pilot overlay as a true "pilot", subject to review in a fixed time period. (6/14/07) Stay in effect for one year, then evaluated for effectiveness (NR)*
- b. *Two separate Land Use or Zoning Codes – one for the neighborhoods included in the overlay environs and another one for the rest of the City. 6/14/07)*
- c. *Infill development should provide high-density development along transportation corridors. Appropriate development should be located in all neighborhoods, not just in the U of A area. (6/14/07)**
- d. *The extension of the streetcar route will provide excellent opportunities for new development and redevelopment of properties in those areas. (6/14/07)**
- e. *Apply overlay to R-1, R-2 and R-3 zones (NR)*
- f. *Adopt pilot overlay and the NPZ ordinance as soon as possible. The original NPA language works as is and does not need to be altered (NR)*
- g. *Measurement of boundaries begins at the UA campus boundaries, rather than center of UA (NR)*
- h. *Use good development to revitalize areas for infill on vacant lots. (Group B - 7/21/07)*
- i. *Locate areas that are appropriate to have minimum and maximum floor area ratios by using a map to identify those areas (Group B - 7/21/07)*
- j. *Developers should build to match the character/look of the neighborhood taking consideration for the following in each neighborhood:*
 - i. *Building heights, landscaping, lot coverage, no lot splits**
- k. *An overlay might be too broad. There should be specific area designs for each neighborhood to ensure that developers are matching the neighborhood's character. (Group B 7/21/07)**
- l. *Smart Development: (Group B 7/21/07)**
 - i. *Consistent with the neighborhood, appropriate in aesthetics, compatible with architecture, a way for the property to be managed whether in or out of state.*
- m. *The overlay should apply to residential areas only, particularly R-1. There is no need to include commercial as that use is allowed on arterials and in commercially zoned areas.**
- n. *Take an area, like the central city and create a new code, an urban code; leave the current one for the more suburban areas of the city/area. (Group C 7/21/07)*
- o. *Owners of properties along arterials within the pilot area that are suitable for intense develop (current zoning for more density) should be encouraged to build multi-story, mixed use projects (Group A 7/21/07)**
- p. *Voluntary guidelines, voluntary compliance and incentives (Group A 7/28/07)**
- q. *Single family residential policy in neighborhoods = sing family detached. (Group A 7/28/07)*
- r. *Any neighborhood included in the pilot area may opt out of the overlay zone (Group A 7/28/07)*
- s. *Provide transferable development rights (Group A - 7/28/07)*
- t. *Impact fees applied to neighborhoods where improvements are being made (Group A 7/28/07)*

4. Potential Areas of Agreement Related to this Issue Category

- a. *Pilot should be for a set period of time and then reviewed. Mayor and Council could evaluate its effectiveness, modify or eliminate. (NR)*
- b. *Creative development in neighborhoods should be encouraged (6/28/07 meeting)*
- c. *Consensus of group A on boundaries for the pilot overlay (Group A 6/28/07)*
 - i. *All shaded/highlighted neighborhoods on pilot area map (registered associations) and neighborhoods not registered within a 2 mile radius shown on the map*

Land Use Planning/Infrastructure

Zoning

Voluntary Agreements/Non-Zoning

* = item referenced in companion document

(FA) - Feldman Asso. Proposal

(NR) - Neighborhood Reps (Altaffer)

(DHSW) Drew, Hudson, Studwell, Wilt

(RB) Ruth Beeker Compilation

- ii. *All zoning districts*
- d. *Group boundaries should be realistic; density should be planned and not allowed to happen indiscriminately. (7/21/07)*
- e. *Infill locations proposed by committee sub-group working on map (to be presented)*
- f. *Development is appropriate along the major arterial roads and occasionally on collectors or the street line., not in historic areas (Group B - 7/21/07)*

Category F - Work for the Future/Thinking Beyond the Zone-Suggestion and Recommendations

- a. *Create a process for neighborhoods and developers to work together to accomplish: (DHSW)**
 - i. *Identify key areas essential for preservation and properties in need of rehabilitation*
 - ii. *Develop incentives for developers to build in areas identified for more intense, higher density development*
 - iii. *Plan for buffering space between intense development areas and single family resident areas*
- b. *Initiating better COT planning for the future through: (RB)*
 - i. *Creation of an Area Plan which defines existing areas of preservation and potential areas of more intense development based on an inventory of what exists.**
 - ii. *Development of a dual Land Use Code, using the existing one for outlying suburban areas and writing a new urban code which better responds to the unique needs of the inner city*
 - iii. *Development of a city-wide comprehensive plan*
- c. *Long term planning for growth like Portland, Oregon's use of growth boundaries over a 20-year period. Growth expands outside the boundaries incrementally based on an agreed upon number. (Group C- 7/21/07)*
- d. *The committee will commit to do the work of a plan if given the time and the promise that it will be implemented as designed by the committee (Group C 7/21/07)*
- e. *Enforcement of permitting is important - including "policing" against "bootleg" improvements to existing homes/structures (Group C 7/21/07)*
- f. *Perhaps it is important to be part of the UofA discussions planned for 2008 re: growth boundaries (Group C - 7/21/07)*
 - i. *The U of A Comprehensive Plan indicates that the campus has the capacity within its current boundaries to double its square footage. (Group C 7/21/07)*
- g. *Something needs to be undertaken now to halt inappropriate development while the pilot discussions are taking place. (7/28/07)*